

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

LANCE POUGH,)	CASE NO. 4:04CV1427
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE PETER C. ECONOMUS
)	
STATE OF OHIO,)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE
)	WILLIAM H. BAUGHMAN, JR.
Respondent.)	
)	MEMORANDUM OPINION
)	AND ORDER

On July 27, 2004, Lance Pough, filed a *pro se* writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging the constitutionality of his criminal conviction (Dkt. # 1). The case was referred to Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr., pursuant to Local Rule 74.2 (Dkt. # 13). On September 26, 2006, the Magistrate Judge recommended dismissing part of Petitioner's application as procedurally defaulted and denying the remaining claims as without merit. (Dkt. # 54). On October 6, 2006, Petitioner filed a motion for an extension of time to file objections to the Magistrate Judge's report (Dkt. # 56). The Court granted Petitioner's motion, ordering him to file his objections by November 3, 2006. (Dkt. # 57).

Petitioner has failed to timely file any such objections. Therefore, the Court must

assume that Petitioner is satisfied with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Any further review by this Court would be duplicative and an inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), aff'd, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir.1981).

Therefore, the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation (Dkt. # 54) is hereby **ADOPTED** and Petitioner's writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED**. Furthermore, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. §2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Peter C. Economus - November 7, 2006
PETER C. ECONOMUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE